

The Hartford Seminary Foundation

BULLETIN

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

FORD LEWIS BATTLES

HENRY ALLAN GLEASON, JR.

JANE SATTLER

ALPHA STALSON

Number 12

January, 1952

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
A Message from the Publications Committee	
Is Christ Divided? Russell Henry Stafford	3
Some Impressions of Swedish University Life E. Jerome Johanson	20
The Warrington Collection: A Research Adventure at the Case Memorial Library Irving Lowens	29
A Thanksgiving Sermon of Jonathan Edwards, Jr. Wesley C. Ewert	39
A Carnegie Grant for The Kennedy School of Missions	45
In Memoriam: Mrs. Arthur Lincoln Gillett	48
Recent Lectures, Conferences and Developments	51
The Charles Henry Brent Lectures on Church Unity	
Lecture by Professor Bultmann	
Conference on International Aspects of Social Work	
Change in Postgraduate Studies	
Alumni Associations of the Foundation	

Is Christ Divided?

CONVOCATION ADDRESS

September 18, 1951

by President RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD

Facing factionalism at Corinth, St. Paul put his rhetorical question, "Is Christ divided?" That question still recurs in the face of modern denominationalism.

This company affords a provisional answer. For we come from many denominations. Yet we are clearly just now one body, with one spirit of mutual liking and trust, and a sense of having everything in common. There are many differences among us, of sex, of age, of complexion, of costume. But there is nothing to show on the surface, in behavior or expression, to which of the Christian Churches any one of us belongs.

How shall we account for this present realization of oneness despite our acknowledged disparities? St. Paul talked of one body with many members; that is, organs and limbs. But that applies better within a congregation (where the legs, for instance, are readily recognizable, because they are always kicking) than in the advanced stage of factionalism exhibited by many denominations, each of which performs all religious functions for its own members, and is therefore a complete body in itself. Modern biology will suggest the analogy of cells, each self-contained, yet all mutually dependent, and operating conjointly to make up one body of living matter. That is an analogy which deserves on some occasion further exploratory. It might be fruitful of hints as to both the course of disease and the conditions for health in the whole community of Christians; that is, the one Church, which includes all the Churches, yet is more than the sum of them.

Before we address ourselves to reflection upon the current situation, we may well examine the New Testament record, as to whether at that initial stage it attests Christian unity or otherwise. We recall how vigorously St. Paul asserted unity. But why did he have to assert it, if no one denied it? Disputes and divisions appear to have begun when the Church began. They even flared up among the first twelve when our Lord was still on earth. We may suppose that he had an eye to his intimate circle, by way of warning them, as well as to certain attacks upon his own works, when he said, "If a house be divided against itself, that house will not be able to stand." Already within the Apostolic period there is evidence of rival parties within local Churches, and divergent usages in Churches of different localities. And one major schism had arisen between those who would make conformity with the Torah a condition for Christian fellowship and those who would not.

Acts 15 purports to tell how this quarrel was patched up. But that is not a contemporaneous report. It bears the marks of editorial effort to explain by explaining away. There are reasons to doubt whether the split was ever healed, except perhaps temporarily and on the surface; indeed, for holding that it continued unabated until the stubborn Judaizing minority at length died out, still objurgating its opponents for heresy. So there is one word we had better not use about the objective of the Church unity movement in our day. It is not a movement for reunion, as if we started out from unity. We did not.

Suppose we admit then that we not only belong to different Churches within the one Church, but that we like our own Churches, and are in no hurry to give them up. I, for instance, should be glad if there were only one kind of Church; but on condition of its being the Congregational kind. We like one another across these frontiers, but it is in our own kind of Church that we feel at home. Making

Is Christ Divided?

no bones about that, yet on the other hand not taking it too seriously, suppose we enquire how these differences came about in the first place; and then look into what keeps these different Christian organizations still going separately in our time.

They came to be in the first place, of course, out of differences of opinion concerning creed, or the right explanation or description of religious experience; cult, or the right order of worship; polity, or the right system of Church government. If where I say "opinion" you prefer to put "conviction," I have no objection; a conviction is an opinion held more stubbornly. But now I am going to propose a daring hypothesis which I will shortly endeavor to justify. I suggest that differences of conviction on these points may and usually do spring simply from differences in point of view, though all may be looking toward the same truth of experience and aspiration, from where they happen severally to stand. Let me suggest further that the point of view at which one shall stand is determined partly by what we know about things in general, and for the rest by what we feel; that is, by what is congenial to our habits of association or to our individual temperaments.

First, in matters of creed, we tend to emphasize the truths which fit in most easily with our general outlook on the universe, plus our way of feeling about life, and to neglect truths less readily accommodated. We tend inevitably to paint our particular picture of God in Christ, and His way with men, in the lines of our private perspective, and the colors that have the most appeal to our taste. Who shall prove that my picture is not true to my eye, that is, that from where I stand this is not really how God looks? Or that yours is not equally true from where you stand?

In other words, theology is relative. There is only one God; and He is absolute. But my view or yours of Him can hardly be more than relatively correct. For we may be

looking at Him from different standpoints as to general worldview. Neither of us can see all around Him. Nor are our eyes perfect; and our craftsmanship as artists may be less perfect than our sight. The important thing would seem to be that you and I shall both be looking from where each happens to stand toward the same object; namely, God in Christ. Many quarrels would be avoided if Christians were ready to acknowledge that there are different ways of looking at one truth, while God is great enough for them all, and is the same God, no matter from what angle and in what setting we see Him.

Secondly, in matters of cult or worship, taste has more weight than reason. By taste I mean instinctive preference. Some of us are naturally formal. We love dignity, decorum, a certain stateliness. We enjoy saying "Sir" and "Your Excellency." Others are just as naturally informal. To us protocol seems artificial. We prefer first names. We are all for the spontaneous, even though it verge upon the uncouth. Transfer these preferences from human relations to Godward approach, and the basic difference underlying many divergent forms of worship emerges at once: the difference, so to speak, between prayerbook and prayer meeting. Which is right? That is hardly the question. Which is right for me? That is the question. But shall I tell the prayerbook folk that they must come to prayer meeting, or vice versa? Prayer is the thing, real prayer; and God hears it, whether by rote in stately periods, or on impulse in slapdash ejaculations!

Thirdly, on points of polity or government, private disposition has more to do with our ecclesiastical theory than any provable precedent. Your aggressive individualist, who sees no reason not to believe in himself and the common man and common sense in general, will be all for freedom, and for decisions by popular vote, without any priest or other privileged official to give authoritative guidance.

Is Christ Divided?

Your strong sustainer of law and order, on the other hand, will not be satisfied with anything less than a rigid constitution and elaborate by-laws, and an official caste fully entrenched to enforce the regulations; not only priests but bishops, and if possible some kind of supreme pontiff. Then why should there not be Churches for both extremes, and all the way between? Is there anything in the gospel to forbid people of either bent from turning to Christ without leaving their own constitution behind, so to speak?

Trouble arises only when one or another group claims to be alone in conformity with the New Testament norm of Church organization. Most groups, all the way from the Quakers to the Roman Catholics, have at one time or another confidently advanced that claim, consigning the others to irregular status if not to outer darkness. Fortunately New Testament scholarship now offers relief from these tensions, and permits the fact-minded to treat such mutually exclusive pretensions humorously, by pointing out that there is no New Testament norm. For just about everything happened in separate situations in the early days of Churchmanship. Hence we may choose the polity that suits us best, without either boasting of our own legality or calling other Christians by bad names.

Thus the differences of creed, cult and polity which have arisen among Christians sprang in the first instance from making too much of such matters, as if they were in the nature of God rather than in the type of our reactions to Him. How deep do such divisions go today?

There is no denying the depth of the cleavage between Catholic and Protestant; that is, between those on the one hand who maintain that the sacraments, including holy orders, and under strict conditions as to their continuous validity, are the normally indispensable channels of saving grace, and those, on the other hand, who believe that salvation is by faith, the sacraments being symbolic or supplemen-

tary rather than necessary and directly efficacious. Even so, Catholic and Protestant, one by one, when they compare notes at the level of their experience of God, find much if not everything in common. On this ground there is an increasing friendliness toward Protestantism on the part of the Eastern Orthodox communion and of Anglo-Catholics.

The Roman Church, however, makes so much of its audaciously unhistorical assertion of monopoly and its bid for world power, that over against it as a body, though not without affection for many saints and reverence for much goodness within it, we feel that we must with reluctant severity take a firm stand. We must face it that there is no prospect whatever of any kind of working agreement in general between the Roman Catholics and other Christian bodies, unless and until the Roman Catholic Church itself changes radically from within.

But I venture to declare that the divisions among other Christian bodies are no longer maintained, save by rare extremists, one might almost say fanatics, along lines of creed, cult or polity, as if any one of them were solely right or any other wholly wrong. In practice most of us have recognized the relativity of our views, and we commit ourselves to them only provisionally, with full mutual charity. We do not believe any longer that a man's faith is conditioned upon the accuracy of his theological understanding.

Among most ministers of all denominations theological disagreements follow, as it were, party groupings which cross denominational lines; and they are debated, not as matters of life and death, but as points for friendly intellectual discussion. As for laymen, in general they belong either to the Churches in which they were born, or to Churches to which they have transferred, with little or no criticism from any quarter, on grounds of personal preference; often, in our migratory towns, to Churches with which they have affiliated without any information or curiosity on theoretical lines, but

Is Christ Divided?

simply because they like the minister and the people, the location is convenient, and there is a good Church School for the children. A large percentage of the members of any city Church have come to it from other denominations elsewhere, with no sense of disloyalty or of re-conversion in doing so. An average city congregation of any denomination is as truly a demonstration of Christian unity as is this present assemblage.

Even ministers belong often to their particular denominations because of the congeniality of their folkways, so to speak, rather than through commitment to some historic position. For instance, I would thank nobody for suggesting that I am not a good Congregationalist. Yet I became a Congregationalist almost by accident; that is, because I had a coveted opportunity to become assistant to a great Congregational minister while I was still in seminary. I am not a Calvinist, though the Congregational fellowship is rooted in Calvinism. And frankly, as for the alleged sacredness of the autonomy of the local Church, I do not believe that the Congregational practice founded upon it is any more free than some others, while I suspect that it is more awkward and less equitable. I am a Congregationalist because I am used to the Congregational ways of doing things. I like our Congregational people, and all my friends among them; and I am sure that I can serve God just as well in this house where I live as in any other of His houses.

Am I stating the situation as it obtains generally today? Then I suggest that we stop worrying about the mere fact that there are different Churches within the one Church, as if the one Church were in consequence a divided house, which will not be able to stand. If we want scriptural warrant for these facts as we find them, we may recall another word of Our Lord, reported by St. John in reference to the next life, though it fits this context readily, and is obscure in that. "In my Father's house are many rooms," as a late

version puts it. "In my Father's compound are many dwellings," so the Chinese would express the idea more comprehensibly. Or, to paraphrase one stage further, "In my Father's community are many houses."

Any community with many houses is a better place to live than one big flat building with a whole townful of people in it. Why? First, because architectural variety is pleasing to the eye. Secondly, because people are often better neighbors when they live farther apart, and can do as they will within the bounds of decency, and make as much noise as they please without bothering the people next door. Thirdly, and not least important, because in a big flat building the janitors and elevator boys have things too much their own way, and always have their hands out, and you must give them high perquisites or else you get slack service. Read "all-inclusive Church organization" for "flat building," and "Church officials," whether bishops and priests or pastors and board secretaries, for "janitors and elevator boys," and you will see what I mean.

It may be surmised from what I have just said that I am not enamoured of One Big Church Administration, with everybody in it, as a remedy for Christian divisiveness. No animadversions upon unified organization as the method to be preferred for demonstrating the unity of all Christians can be warranted today, however, without proper consideration of the recent establishment of the Church of South India, which has brought together in one administrative system the major elements of Christian life and witness in the area it serves, including the local dioceses originally established by the Anglican communion.

There can be no belittling of the magnitude of this achievement, nor of its devoted motivation, nor of its desirability in confrontation with a particular situation. The question remains, however, whether this be an example which should be everywhere followed.

Is Christ Divided?

That it must be so taken is the argument of Lesslie Newbigin, the Scottish Presbyterian Bishop of the Mathurai Diocese of the new Church, in his widely read book *The Reunion of the Church* (Harper and Brothers, 1948). Bishop Newbigin is a great missionary. And Dean Potter and I, as past Presidents of the American Board, have cause to be gratified that he has already proved himself to be a great diocesan; for one of the major missions of our Board is now under his wise and skilful care. Yet of this book I fear one must say that it is clumsily written; replete with terms undefined and concepts unanalyzed; deeply colored, moreover, by a particular theology, which none but its partisans will mistake for the gospel, the whole gospel, and nothing but the gospel.

In it the case is strongly put and clearly made for the urgency of organizational uniformity among Christian Churches distributed one to a town in a population for which the religious norm is non-Christian, and with frequent removals of Christians from one town to another. It is hardly open to debate that beyond mutual recognition and inter-communion an actual bond of governmental procedure is all but requisite to give cohesion and strength to a hard-pressed minority seeking to witness persuasively for Christ to an overwhelming majority prejudiced by all its habit-patterns against the Christian way of thinking and living.

The fact remains that the Church of South India is as yet far from achieving its goal. Instead of carrying their new partners into the communion of Canterbury, its erstwhile Anglican factors are surprisingly pronounced by Lambeth to be in schism, subject to review of the case some thirty years hence. Several important Protestant bodies are still going their own ways. And of course the Roman Catholics are completely outside the picture.

Moreover, in offering his Church as a model for the Church throughout the world Bishop Newbigin innocently

overlooks the radical difference between a pioneering Christian minority in a vast population historically committed to a non-Christian norm, on the one hand, and on the other hand the Churches which serve areas where Christianity, however neglected it may be in practice, is as naturally accepted as the religious norm as Hinduism is in South India. God knows who the Christians are among us; but we know how many Church members there are. There are so many that in our towns of any size it would be physically impossible to include them all in any one congregation with any of the distinctive attributes of Church life.

If we had only one organization, still we should have to have several or many parishes in the same town. The Roman Catholic Church meets this difficulty by drawing geographical lines. But these often work hardship. I have had Roman Catholic friends who were sadly upset because the diocese had shifted parish boundaries and they found themselves consigned willy-nilly in consequence to a local Church with which they had no prior ties, leaving behind them the fellowship to which they were accustomed. I have also known brothers and their families, living across the street from each other, required to go to different churches because the boundary followed that street.

Granted that some lines must be drawn, then, to allow for the multiple parishes needed in a place with too many members for one congregation, why should not considerations of taste and congeniality as to creed, cult and polity, and even as to personal association, be allowed to operate within the Christian community in any locality? Provided that the various units will live in peace and cooperate for ends manifestly better pursued together than in separation, what harm can be done to the Christian witness by providing that the Christian life can be lived in a Church home to one's own particular liking?

This is not to suggest, of course, that unified or-

Is Christ Divided?

ganization is never to be sought. It cannot too often be said that, as a matter of plain common sense, there are too many Protestant denominations, with too little dividing them, each with its costly and topheavy overhead. To acknowledge, however, that some unions of this type are overdue is by no means to concede that one all-inclusive union at the administrative level is either the only feasible or the most desirable demonstration of Christian unity. That is like suggesting that there should be only one kind of flowers in a garden. Within his one garden any gardener is prouder of many different flowerbeds, each with its own type of soil and nurture, than of a monotonous spread of sweet peas only; or chrysanthemums.

Let us return, then, to the metaphor of which this garden figure is a variant, namely, many homes in our Father's community.

We are talking about a community, mind you, not just an accidental collection of houses. We are talking about friends and neighbors, loyal to the community in principle and practice; not about people who just happen to live near one another, but who have nothing further in common by their own choice, and don't care to know one another. It is my thesis that there is no harm, and some gain, in having a variety of Churches, following different styles of architecture, so to speak, to cover the whole range of our natural temperaments, provided the whole population in all the houses regards itself as a unit.

Can that be said of our Churches? Not always; and not yet to the degree we must anticipate, and strive to attain. But when we fail to behave like good neighbors, and to work together for the interests we have in common, it is by our own fault, and not for lack of a community tie, if only we will heed it. For we all belong to one neighborhood, because we all believe in Jesus Christ.

We believe in him, I said; not, We believe alike about

him. That is not the same thing. To believe in him is like believing in our best friend. It is to have faith in him. It is to love him. Since we feel that he is better and wiser than we are, it is to turn to him for guidance in perplexity, and heed his advice, and depend upon his encouragement; it is to follow him. Christian faith is not argumentatively believing in a creed; not to begin with. It is personally believing in a person.

When we have faith, to be sure, we look for a creed; that is, a description of this experience, and an explanation of what it means, which will be satisfactory to our minds. And of course, in a secondary fashion, we shall believe in our own creed, because we understand it, while we may be dubious of our neighbor's. Yet we will not impugn on that account his faith, that is, his religious experience.

After all, while he and I both stand in the sunshine, my neighbor may believe that the sun revolves around the earth, while I know that the earth revolves around the sun. No doubt I am right and he is wrong; still, we are both in the sunshine. And that is what counts for both of us.

Christian faith is knowing Jesus personally, as we find him in the Gospels, and he finds us today; loving him, having confidence in him, doing our best to live like him. That common faith, that experience of looking to Jesus as the beginning and the end of our trust in God and our conscience on earth and our hope for this world and beyond, is the tie that binds all the members of all the households of the Church into one community. While we keep that faith to the fore, we shall not quarrel about mere differences of opinion; we shall be too busy doing what he bids us. It is only when we forget our faith that we push up our opinions into the front rank, and begin fighting among ourselves instead of pulling together.

For the Lord in whom we believe is no teacher of abstruse dogmas difficult to grasp. We find him teaching, to be sure,

Is Christ Divided?

in the Gospels; but out of doors, not in a classroom, and teaching everybody, in such simple language, and with such telling illustrations, that there can be no mistake about his meaning, nor hardly any dissent from its truth, I should suppose, among people of good will. God is our Father, and we can trust Him. Other people are our brothers and sisters, and for His sake and theirs and our own we must do everything we can to help them. If we will just do that, we can safely leave the outcome in God's hands.

That is not a theology, though there is room for hanging all sorts of theology on it. I am glad there is; for I like theology. But no theology, false or true, is worth anything, unless it have at its core that simple message, which is not a system of thought for academicians, but a platform and a program for everyday living for everybody.

It is on the basis of that platform, trust in God, and that program, helping our brothers and sisters by sharing these insights with them, and lending them a hand, that the Christian community can come together for community meetings, to pool resources and plan operations, that the Good News in word and deed may sink in and spread out at home and abroad, as the waters both sink in and spread out when they cover the sea. And therein lies the significance of Councils of Churches, local, national, and worldwide, including many denominations. In such Councils we do not come together to debate our differences of opinion, rooting down as they do into our private preferences, not to say limitations and biases. We come together to see how we can best work together, and what more we can do together on the business of Our Lord. Nor do we proceed by majority vote of the delegates, with power in any assembly to coerce dissenting minorities. We proceed toward finding the sense of the meeting, minorities included; that we may be indeed one body, with one spirit.

Our imaginations have been stirred of late by two great

achievements in this realm of conjoint action by a vast number of Church organizations: the founding of the World Council of Churches in 1948; the uniting of the Federal Council with 7 other interdenominational agencies into the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, in 1950. It is notable that history attests the practical aims underlying both these achievements.

The Federal Council was founded in 1908 as the result of measures originating as far back as 1887 to apply the Christian conscience unitedly to the wrongs of latter-day American society. Social Action, soberly considered in the light of Christ, was its mainspring.

Its type of organization was something new under the sun. It has set the pattern for similar Councils of Churches in several other nominally Christian lands, and for National Christian Councils in lands served by foreign missions, as they have since come into being. The World Council, however, though it too is patterned on our American Federal Council, is the outcome of an initiative taken by Foreign Missions, when Protestant forces of all lands and denominations met in Edinburgh in 1910 to consider how the Christian cause could best be furthered in lands historically non-Christian.

It was by his signal participation in this Edinburgh meeting, by the way, that President McKenzie of Hartford was prompted to the creative improvisation which was to become our Kennedy School of Missions, the only interdenominational graduate school of missiology in any University in the world.

I will not take time to trace the steps by which in turn the International Missionary Council, the Conference on Faith and Order, and the Conference on Life and Work, arose out of Edinburgh 1910, finally joining hands at Amsterdam in the World Council of Churches, with the International Missionary Council, a professional agency com-

Is Christ Divided?

posed of missionaries and missions executives, as its right hand. Rather, the point I am making is this: Just as the National Council consists of its constituent bodies intent upon the gospel sinking in here at home, to permeate all layers of American life with Christian ideals and their practical fruits, so the World Council consists likewise of its constituent bodies intent, in the first instance, upon the gospel spreading out, that all mankind may receive its benefits in both soul and body.

Christianity comes into demonstration only as Christians look away from the differences of opinion and habit among them, to recognize and reaffirm and put forward their common cause of doing Christ's work in his spirit, up and down, near and far, throughout the regions of man's habitation. That is why we call the movement Oecumenical: not because it seeks to include all Christians; but because it aims at practical Christian influence "throughout the inhabited earth," which is what "Oecumenical" means.

So few are familiar with Greek nowadays that perhaps I ought to stop to explain that statement exactly. Our word "oecumenical" is the transliteration of a Greek adjective formed by substituting an adjectival ending for the participial ending of the present passive participle feminine singular of the Greek verb meaning "to inhabit." This participle, with the definite article, agreeing in number and gender with the noun meaning "earth," understood, was regularly used to mean "the inhabited earth." Hence the Oecumenical Church is the Church pertaining to, or extending through, the inhabited earth; the Church, at present among, or moving towards, "all people that on earth do dwell." The reference is to the extension of the Christian Movement, rather than to any of its internal characteristics.

Perhaps you will feel that I should have said more about some scheme of salvation, and about winning acceptance of that scheme by all men in order that they may go to heaven

when they die. Don't suppose, I beg you, that I have left out that theme because I am not concerned for salvation, or because I have no idea what the scheme of it may be, or because I do not believe in Heaven. As a matter of fact, I have distinct opinions, or call them profound convictions if you will, on these subjects; and, as I am a fairly orthodox parson. I dare say many or most of you would agree with me. But, if I were to talk to you along these lines, that would be theology; and theology is not reality, but a description of it. No description of the sun ever warmed a man as sunlight does. First stand in the sun, then find out about it; and the sun was just as warm before Copernicus and Galileo as after them.

What Christ would have us do is to make life brighter and happier, inside and out, for high and low, individually and collectively, in the town where we live; in the land of our citizenship; and in the whole world beyond. It is at the ground level of human need that we must work with Christ the Saviour; not in the thin clouds of abstract speculation.

Home Missions, Foreign Missions, interracial good will, industrial justice, a fair chance for every child, decent provision for the old and the sick and the underdog—these are tasks to which we can address ourselves collectively. And on them the Christian conscience is united. Our minds are by no means always united, to be sure, as to the ways of achieving them. But we can work out the right ways by experiment as we go along, provided we will really work together in the down-to-earth areas of actual want under Jesus' leadership.

I have not yet said a word, either, about that currently popular topic, Christianity versus Communism. Let me make two points positive. First, on the issue between freedom and the police state, Russian or any other, I am on the side of freedom. Secondly, as a Christian I regard the Communist system with intellectual contempt and moral loathing. But these lead up to a third point: there would be no appeal in

Is Christ Divided?

Communism to the underprivileged anywhere, whom it professes to befriend, and to whom it proffers delusive promises of relief and release, if Christians had come together sooner, or would work together harder, to set right the evils of human society which arise out of greed, exploitation of the defenceless, and social discrimination, as they are practised by heartless enemies of Jesus' principles, as hardboiled as any Communist commissar, though there are many among them who have been baptized. Communism is a death's-head substitute for the life-giving platform and program of Christ, which it is our most urgent obligation collectively to establish and pursue by community action among all who dwell in the many houses of the Father's compound.

It is not too late. It is never too late in God's world. Christ is not divided. There is one body and one spirit. We must work together for victory, not over one another's opinions, but over the actual forces of malignity which undermine the peace and hope and joy of God's children on earth. Not by talking one another down, each in his own tongue, but by working, all with one will, under Our Lord's high command, we will yet achieve that victory.

Some Impressions of Swedish University Life

by E. JEROME JOHANSON

RILEY Professor of Christian Theology,
The Hartford Theological Seminary

A sabbatical leave spent in Sweden is an altogether delightful experience. That was my privilege during the second semester of the academic year 1950-1951. It is with considerable diffidence that one ventures to speak or write about the life and people of another country. It can only be a few impressions that one may offer. My impressions are based upon a limited contact with Swedish academic life. They no doubt need correction by Swedish scholars, or by scholars from other countries who have lived and worked there much longer.

My impressions of Swedish University life were formed during a semester spent at Lund. Five weeks at Uppsala, at the end of the semester, confirmed these impressions. The University at Lund was established in 1668. That makes it 32 years younger than Harvard. But the University at Uppsala goes back to 1477. They are both Royal Universities, supported by the State, and open to all. The fees are merely nominal. A student's main expenses in securing his education are incurred in finding a room, securing his meals, books, etc. They have no dormitories, and no college dining halls. There are four faculties: medicine, law, theology and philosophy. The latter is divided into science and arts. There are about 4,000 students at Uppsala and about 3,000 at Lund. In 1949 there were 179 theological students at Uppsala; 124 at Lund.

Theological students matriculate at the University at

Some Impressions of Swedish University Life

about 18. They usually spend the first year under the philosophical faculty taking courses in Hebrew and advanced Greek and Latin. They have learned their English, German and French before coming to the University. After they have passed the required examinations under the philosophical faculty, they enroll with the theological faculty. They spend about three years attending lectures, preparing seminar papers and reading theology. Their lectures and seminar sessions are carried on much as ours are here.

One soon gets the impression that these Swedish theological candidates are able men. They are excellent linguists. They do much reading in Greek, Latin and German texts. They can all read and understand English and many of them speak English very well. Their seminar sessions are often bilingual or trilingual. Here is a student from Germany. He will write his seminar paper in German, and the students will all read his paper in advance. At the beginning of the seminar session, he may make a brief statement in German summarizing what he has tried to do in his paper. The critic will go over his paper very thoroughly, speaking in Swedish. The author will defend himself in German. An American student may break in with a question or comment in English. The reply will come back in German. One also meets with surprises over there. One of the more advanced students presented an excellent paper on one aspect of Luther's theology. He spoke in Swedish. It sounded to me like a very fine Swedish. After the session I commented on his fine Swedish to another student and asked who he was. "Oh," came the reply, "*He is a Hungarian. He came here as a refugee, but he is now a Swedish citizen.*"

The theological students at Lund comprise an ecumenical group. There were students from Finland, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, India, the United States as well as from the Scandinavian countries. They came from various churches. But they worked together under the Lutheran theological

faculty at Lund in fine spirit. The professors are equally ecumenical-minded. They invited visitors from other countries and churches to speak to their students. A Roman Catholic theologian from Holland lectured in German. Professor Edmund Schlink from Heidelberg described the theological situation in Germany. They even invited me to give a lecture in English on Jonathan Edwards.

The impression one gets is that they do very thorough work at Lund. Their seminar papers are of a high order. Their advanced work for the doctorate in theology is very rigorous. Their Doctor's theses, usually published in German, English or French, are thorough pieces of research. They represent years of labor. They are not often written by young students. Last May there were conferred three doctorates in theology at Lund. The ages of the recipients were 31, 39 and 43. After their thesis has been published, and permission is granted by the faculty for the examination, the student nails up his thesis on the bulletin board of the theological faculty. The date for the defense of the thesis is announced. This is a continuation of the old academic custom, which Luther followed when he nailed up his famous 95 theses. The examination is a public affair. Several opponents are designated by the faculty to conduct the examination. The questioning will usually continue for two hours in the morning and then, after a break for lunch, there will be another session lasting from one to two hours. After the faculty examination is completed, anyone in the audience is at liberty to ask questions of the candidate. The whole examination is conducted in a thorough, formal manner. Both the candidate and the examiners are dressed in full dress evening clothes. After the examination there is a formal dinner to which the candidate's family, professors and friends are invited.

The graduation exercises, at which only the doctor's degrees are conferred, are far more elaborate, colorful, and

Some Impressions of Swedish University Life

dramatic than they are in the U.S.A. Perhaps the commencement at Lund last May was unusually elaborate because the new king was present and received an honorary degree. The service was held in the cathedral, which was beautifully decorated with flowers. The academic procession moved from the main university building to the cathedral through an aisle kept clear by two rows of soldiers. They were all presenting arms. The marshalls wore broad, gaily colored ribbons over their shoulders. There were men in clericals, military and naval officers in decorated uniforms, men in colorful foreign academic gowns, and men in full evening dress. The cathedral was packed. The service was conducted in Latin. When the theological candidates received their degrees, they came up one at a time and stood before their dean. In conferring the degree Dean Ragnar Bring placed a high black silk hat on their heads. At the moment the hat was put on the new Doctor's head, a cannon was fired just outside the cathedral. One certainly had the impression that an important event had just occurred. When the king came up to receive his degree, the Dean began to give the citation in Latin verse. Half way through, he forgot his lines. After an awkward silence, the embarrassed Dean recovered his memory and without further mishap, finished the citation. When the wreath was placed upon the king's head, two guns were fired. Thereafter the king made two bows to the faculty, just as the other candidates had done, and proceeded to his seat. One of the new doctors delivered a Latin oration. Bishop Nygren offered a closing prayer, also in Latin. Then with a Bach recessional, the faculty and graduates left the cathedral. The impression that this beautiful, colorful, dramatic service made on my mind can never be forgotten. I shall always be grateful that the theological faculty invited me to be with them for that significant occasion.

The theologians at Lund and Uppsala have been doing

outstanding work for more than a generation. Those who have read Prof. Nels Ferré's "Swedish Contributions to Modern Theology," are familiar with the main features of their work. This theological reconstruction was begun before the first world war. It was initiated by Professors Nathan Söderblom and Einar Billing at Uppsala, Gustaf Aulén and Anders Nygren at Lund. Nathan Söderblom later became Archbishop and the other three of these professors became Bishops. In fact, most of their Bishops for generations have been chosen from the theological faculties.

These Swedish Systematic Theologians have devoted much thought to the problem of methodology. They have tried to show that Christian theology is a descriptive Science. It is *method* and not content which determines whether a given discipline is a science or not. This means, of course, that they have completely abandoned the old authoritative methodology, and the purely rationalistic methodology.

These men begin with the recognition of Christianity as a living dynamic force in history. That is the field, the body of fact, which is given. The Christian faith as it has expressed itself in history is the object to be investigated. "The task of science," as Bishop Nygren writes, "is to understand its object. . . . The task of systematic theology cannot be anything else than to try to understand and make clear the Christian faith in its characteristic uniqueness."

What is decisive and distinctive in every religion is its conception of God and of God's relation to men. Dean Ragnar Bring puts that thought this way: "That which is characteristic for every religion is the manner whereby that religion understands its relation to the Divine; that which distinguishes the religions is precisely their different ways of conceiving of the Divine and their relation toward it." This basic conception of the nature of God and of His relation to men constitutes what these men call the *grund-motif*. The

Some Impressions of Swedish University Life

basic motif is the unifying and organizing center of a religion. It is the hub which holds together all the spokes of the wheel. Three basic motifs have been worked out in the various religions of history. They lie at the heart of three very different types of religion. They are: the *Nomos* or law motif which characterizes the Hebrew-Jewish religion, the *Eros* motif which makes the Greek type of religion what it is, and the *Agape* or love motif which lies at the heart of the Christian religion. Bishop Nygren has traced the history of the basic motif of the Greek type of religion and of the Christian religion and of their influence upon each other. It remains for other scholars to trace the history of the *nomos* motif and its interaction with the *agape* motif, and the interaction between the *nomos* and the *eros* motifs. Nygren's study is not intended to be a study of the history of two words. It is not a discussion of whether man has, or has not, a natural capacity for love. It is a comparison and a contrast between two wholly different religions, two completely different conceptions of God and of His relationship with men. The reason that Nygren never mentions the Greek word *phileo* which also means 'to love', is that it has never become the central organizing principle of any historic religion. Nygren has tried to show that the conception of God, who in holy love goes out through Christ to offer all men forgiveness, healing, reconciliation, and eternal life is the distinctive and determinative fact in the Christian religion. If any one else can show that some other conception of God and of His relation to men is the basic motif of historic Christianity he is welcome to do so. The test of what is the basic motif of a given religion is whether or not it yields a satisfactory explanation of what that religion has actually been in its historic development. Both Nygren and Bring have written substantial books describing and explaining this new theological methodology.

There is one additional word to be added about this scientific methodology. These men all insist that theology, as a strict science, makes no value judgments. The business of systematic theology is to try to understand and describe the Christian religion. It is not to try to demonstrate by scientific means the superiority of one religion over another. All historical religions do make value judgments. It is the task of theology to describe those judgments, not to make them. Nygren in his study of *Eros* and *Agape* never says that the one is superior or inferior to the other. "We are," he writes, "concerned with judgments of fact, not with judgments of value. It is, of course, true that as the ideas of *Eros* and *Agape* are living forces today, they can compel both the writer and the reader to decide their personal attitude towards them; but that decision lies outside the province of this book." Theology, as a strict science, prescribes no norms. It does not say what ought to be believed, but what has been believed within historic Christianity. "Just as little as ethics can undertake to tell men what they ought to do," writes Bishop Aulén, "so systematic theology, which is directed toward a study of faith, cannot presume to determine what ought to be believed."

As to content, the theology of these men is definitely theocentric. What makes a given religion what it is is its conception of God. "The Christian faith," says Aulén, "is thoroughly theocentric, and . . . all its affirmations are affirmations about God. The character of the conception of God is decisive for the whole content of Christian faith." The Christian's knowledge of God and the Christian's relation with God are largely determined by God's own self-giving in Christ. At this decisive point, the theology of these men is influenced by the witness of the New Testament and by the faith of Luther. Paul's witness was that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." Luther's central conviction was: "We find the heart and will of the

Some Impressions of Swedish University Life

Father in Christ." Aulén writes, "The deed of Christ removes the veil and reveals the heart of God . . . The self-sacrificing and self-giving love of Christ is the love of God Himself, its struggle against evil is God's own struggle, and its victory is God's own victory. In the deed of Christ God realizes his own will and love." The basic conviction of these Swedish writers is that God is holy love. God reveals and offers all men that love in Christ. God's love is offered to undeserving men unconditionally and unreservedly. God loves even sinful men sufferingly, redeemingly, and victoriously. God's love is given not for the sake of negating but for the sake of rehabilitating human life. Prof. Gustaf Wingren, who is now Nygren's successor at the University of Lund, believes,—and here he has Karl Barth directly in mind,—that there has been an unnecessary and cruel "trampling down" of man. Some theologians have derived, he says, "a kind of brutal pleasure in magnifying man's insignificance in the eyes of God." "There is," he writes, "no such slander of mankind in the New Testament." God's whole work of creation and redemption is concerned with the restoration of human life so that it can become what it was intended to be.

Here is a strong, clear, hopeful note which modern man needs to hear. The cocky modern man of 50 years ago has now disappeared. The modern man of today is a very different person. He knows there is no automatic painless progress. He knows that he is neither a saint nor an angel. He knows that he desperately needs help if he is to avoid shipwreck for western civilization. He is now wondering where that help can be found. Does he need further denunciation and humiliation? Perhaps he needs that word of God which not only judges, but saves; not only smites, but heals; not only thunders at Sinai, but loves at Calvary; not only destroys the evil, but raises men up to a new and triumphant righteousness. I am grateful for the service rendered Christianity by Karl Barth and Emil Brunner. Personally, I needed fif-

Hartford Seminary Foundation Bulletin

teen years ago precisely what they have to offer. But I for one, now feel the need of more than they offer. I may be mistaken, but it looks to me as though that "more" will come not from Switzerland, but from Sweden.

The Warrington Collection: A Research Adventure At Case Memorial Library

by IRVING LOWENS

[Editor's note: Under the indefatigable Waldo S. Pratt, Professor of Sacred Music (1882-1939), and through the munificence of Thomas Duncan (a member of the Board of Trustees) together with other donors, the Case Memorial Library acquired during the last decade of the nineteenth century two of the largest private hymnological collections, those of Silas H. Paine and James Warrington. Added to existing holdings, they formed one of the most extensive collections of early American and English hymn books in the country. For various reasons this valuable collection has remained largely uncatalogued until the present day. The visit of Professor Allen Britton of the University of Michigan last summer and that of Mr. and Mrs. Irving Lowens of Washington, D.C., a few months later have given us a new realization of the value of this collection. A special place has now been set aside for these books and Miss E. de W. Root, the Foundation Archivist, is at present engaged in making a rough card catalogue of them. It is hoped that the publication of Mr. Lowens' article in this issue of the *Bulletin* will win support for a thorough-going project of cataloguing and preserving this priceless heritage from the past.]

About seventy-five years ago, James Warrington, a Philadelphia accountant of scholarly bent, began the accumulation of materials pertinent to the history and practice of American psalmody. At the time he began his collecting activities, but little significance was attached to this field. Warrington was virtually alone in his interest in it. Fortunately, he was more than a mere book collector; had he not been a scholar by inclination it is doubtful that he would have paid much attention to early American hymn and tune books. These were originally utilitarian rather than decorative objects; they were

given heavy wear and were used until they were quite literally worn out. As a natural consequence, copies in good enough condition to tempt the bibliophile are scarce indeed and always have been; the battered and tattered remnants of most extant copies find their way into the working libraries of institutions and scholars. Legend had it that Warrington was successful in building an unrivalled collection of these materials.

As a student of certain phases of American music history, I first became aware of the probable existence of the Warrington collection through my acquaintance with a comparatively little known bibliographical work by Warrington himself. In 1898, he published privately in a small edition a short-title list of books relating to American psalmody. It seemed quite apparent that a personal library of some magnitude must have been the cornerstone upon which it was based, although no direct statement to that effect appears in the bibliography itself. The check-list suffered from the flaws and defects characteristic of the pioneer work; its sins of omission and commission were many, and it served only as a crude chart to a hitherto unmapped sea of research materials. Nevertheless, despite its all too obvious inadequacies, it was a valuable work.

Although I was mildly curious as to whether Warrington's collection was still available intact, my urge to track it down was somewhat lessened because of the fortunate circumstance that my home happens to be located within an easy half-hour's drive from the excellent research facilities provided by the Library of Congress in Washington. These proved to be adequate for my investigations until late last year, when I began serious work on a project entailing the examination and study of every known American tune book published before 1810. As there are many completely unlocated titles in this field, the question of the present exis-

The Warrington Collection

tence and whereabouts of the Warrington collection became a matter of more than academic interest to me.

There was, of course, no definite assurance that the collection had not been completely dispersed after Warrington's death. One circumstance that led me to believe that this was not likely, however, was the mention in Frank J. Metcalf's 1917 *American Psalmody* (the bibliographical work, by the way, which supplanted Warrington's study) of a "Warrington collection" housed at the Western Theological Seminary in Pittsburgh. This proved to be a false lead, or, at any rate, only part of the complete story. Examination of the titles found in the Pittsburgh "Warrington collection" led to one of two conclusions: either his collection was not as extensive as I had expected, or else only a fraction of it was located in Pittsburgh. The latter assumption proved to be correct. The riddle was finally solved in the course of a discussion with Dr. Allen P. Britton of the University of Michigan, whose definitive bibliographical study of eighteenth century American tune books is to appear in print in the near future. In the compilation of this magnificent scholarly work (which I have been privileged to utilize in manuscript), Dr. Britton had found it necessary to visit a large number of libraries to establish locations of books coming within the scope of his bibliography. In relating his experiences, he remarked that he had found what seemed to be the largest bulk of the Warrington collection at the Case Memorial Library in Hartford; at the time he had not as yet personally examined its holdings in detail, but he expected to do so at the earliest opportunity. Dr. Britton's rough description of its extent aroused my own desire to inspect it at first hand.

The reader may perhaps be curious about my interest in what may superficially appear to be a somewhat narrow and esoteric segment of American culture. As the possible sig-

nificance of the Warrington collection and the significance of research in early American music is rather directly correlated, a few words about this particular field of investigation may be considered pertinent. To a large extent, our generally cavalier attitude toward American music written before roughly 1825 is an inheritance from the mistaken and distorted value judgments of 19th century historians and scholars. Perhaps they were too close to their predecessors to be able to see them clearly; at any rate, they failed completely to comprehend the nature, style and import of our indigenous music. James Warrington was among the first to realize that early America was no musical desert. He charted the bibliography of our religious music with sympathy and understanding (although with the limitations of the pioneer in the field) with the intention of eventually studying its history and development. This he did not live to accomplish. Chronologically, he was followed by the great American musicologist Oscar G. T. Sonneck, whose investigations of the 18th century secular music, commenced at the turn of this century, are now among the classics of musicological literature. At the time they were written, however, interest in American music was at such low ebb that no American publisher willing to publish his *Early Concert Life in America* could be located. Eventually it appeared in 1907 with the Leipzig imprint of Breitkopf and Härtel, the distinguished German music publishing firm. Warrington's successor in bibliographical and historical research in sacred music was Frank J. Metcalf, whose labors began shortly before the first World War. None of the excellent work accomplished by these men succeeded in arousing interest outside a narrow circle of scholars; it was not until 1933 that the tide finally turned. In that year, Dr. George Pullen Jackson, formerly of Vanderbilt University, began the publication of a brilliant series of studies in American spiritual folk song, pointing out not only the unquestionable

beauty of this music, but also establishing a hitherto undetected but none the less important link between the secular and the sacred music of our country. Other men followed, broadening and deepening investigations along both secular and sacred lines.

Today, research in the field of early American music is taking place at an increasing tempo. The reason for this accelerated activity is plain: our folk hymnody and the music written by such folk composers as Billings, Read, French, Brownson, Swan and many others is unique, alive, of the greatest contemporary interest, and more and more people have become aware of this. Aside from the intrinsic merit of the music itself, its social implications are far greater than might appear on the surface. There seem to be definite indications that this music may serve a similar function in the revivification of American church music as did the somewhat parallel rediscovery of English folk song for English church music some time ago. Should this actually take place, it would mean a revolution of the widest scope in sacred music. From a historical point of view, the study of the early American tune books in which our folk hymnody and indigenous psalmody have been preserved intact is capable of throwing much new light into previously dark corners of our country's cultural maturation. To assemble a large collection of these materials today would be an exceedingly costly and difficult task for any institution. From the practical viewpoint, it is necessary to rely on collections already in existence, extending and expanding their holdings. When viewed in this light, it can be seen that the Warrington collection is potentially a social asset of great magnitude.

The opportunity to visit Case Memorial Library finally came my way toward the end of last summer. My wife (who is my co-worker and fellow researcher) and I had spent the major portion of the summer studying the available materials at the Library of Congress; it became necessary for

us to visit several New England libraries in order to complete our survey of early American tune books. Our time was rather severely limited and there was much to be done; certain items had to be seen at New Haven, Worcester, Boston, Providence and New York. However, we did manage to eke out time enough for a brief stop at Case Memorial in order to examine five titles, not easily available elsewhere, we had reason to believe were to be found there. We were hoping to be able to complete our task at Hartford in a few hours, a most optimistic miscalculation. We soon discovered that it would require not hours, but months in order to gain some accurate conception of the mere scope of the Warrington collection, to say nothing of an adequate study of its contents. In our astonishment, our specific mission shrank into relative insignificance and came close to being altogether forgotten; we considered ourselves fortunate in completing the major portion of it as well as in gaining some first-hand knowledge of the stature of the Warrington collection.

At one time or another, every researcher has undoubtedly experienced difficulty in finding the materials he has come to a library to see. It is always just these items, it seems, that are in the process of being catalogued, recatalogued, bound, rebound, or are otherwise unavailable; they have a curious habit of not being where they are supposed to be at the proper time. In the course of our trip, we had run into this situation several times, and we were forced to leave one library without examining three of the books we had traveled some distance to see. In most cases, however, such recalcitrant items were eventually tracked down and placed in our hands by helpful and efficient staff members. We were therefore not particularly alarmed when a careful check of the library catalog at Case Memorial failed to disclose more than one of the five titles in which we were interested. After a double check by the reference librarian verified the

The Warrington Collection

accuracy of our survey, we were guided to what turned out to be *the* Warrington collection and, so to speak, were turned loose among its treasures, an experience and an adventure we shall long remember.

The collection is located in a cellar which was obviously not designed for the convenience of either librarian or research scholar; one of the really essential prerequisites for the use of books, that of light by which to read, was sadly lacking. This difficulty was overcome within the space of a few minutes. Extension cords were obtained and hung so that we could begin a search which turned out to be something in the nature of an archaeological expedition.

The books are shelved, but in widely scattered sections of the cellar. With the exception of very few titles, the collection is completely uncataloged. It is in no discernable order. The only available guide to its actual content, a rough index-card file probably compiled by Warrington himself, was more tantalizing than useful. What was one to make of listings of no less than six separate editions of Thomas Walter's exceedingly rare 18th century *The Grounds and Rules of Musick Explained*? Were they actually there, or was this merely a reference to books Warrington was seeking? We could not find a single copy. Elsewhere, we might well be dubious about such a concentration of editions of a scarce and most important American tune book; here, however, we were forced to concede at least the possibility that the cards meant what they said. Although no copies of the Walter turned up, much else of comparable interest did. The collection is by no means confined to 18th century, or even to American imprints. We found beautiful, crisp copies of 17th century English and Dutch psalters. We found many early English and American secular songsters, perhaps even rarer than tune books. We found an astonishing wealth of 19th century American materials, including a great number of exceedingly interesting shape-note tune books of

Southern and Western origin. Perversely enough, many of these items, which we personally examined, were not to be found in Warrington's own index.

It was not possible for us to gauge with even a rough degree of accuracy the number of titles in the collection as a whole. Certainly there appeared to be thousands of books, ranging from unique copies to commonplaces. We were seeking five specific titles; had not these been printed in a characteristic oblong format which distinguishes them from most others, our task would have been completely hopeless. As it was, there were hundreds in the collection of similar shape and size and working purely by instinct, we managed to locate four after removing approximately one hundred volumes from the shelves. The fifth eluded us completely. No doubt it is there, hiding in some corner that escaped our notice.

If the books we examined are at all characteristic of the Warrington collection as a whole, and there seems to be no reason why they should not be, as our selection was basically a random one, Case Memorial Library must be ranked as one of the most important centers of research materials for the study of early American music in the country. Until the collection is properly and completely cataloged, any opinion regarding its exact place in the hierarchy of libraries specializing in this sort of Americana can be nothing better than a more or less informed guess.

Most of the books seem to be bearing up well under the strain of carrying dust and grime accumulated over a period of perhaps three decades, but some appear to have been attacked, at one time or another, by insects or rodents and are damaged almost beyond repair. Others have suffered from inevitable time damage; their bindings crumble at the slightest touch. All suffer from neglect. It was disconcerting in the extreme to find a book of which perhaps no other copy is known only to discover that a portion of its pages had fur-

The Warrington Collection

nished a meal to some denizen of the animal world; the social waste embodied in such a situation is incalculable. Nevertheless, taking all factors into account, the collection as a whole is in remarkably fine condition. It is still possible to uncover, as we did, copies of rarities so pristine that it would seem they had come from the presses just yesterday, not 200 years ago.

I can think of nothing material to be gained at this time by citing the names of those particular rarities we were privileged to examine and, in a certain sense, to rediscover at Case Memorial Library. Such a list would be of more than casual interest to but few; perhaps it is wiser in this case to arouse curiosity rather than to make a fruitless attempt to satisfy it. Even were it my desire to give some accurate picture of the extent of the collection, I could not do so after a single day's visit. Any selection of titles would inevitably be a distortion.

Nevertheless, I have no doubt of the importance of the Warrington collection. As a very rough objective verification of my subjective impression, I copied the titles of seventy-five of those we examined in order to see to what extent they were available in other libraries we expected to visit later. At Union Theological Seminary (whose library also includes the collection of The Hymn Society of America), I could find but nineteen of the seventy-five. The Library of Congress, whose holdings in this field are probably exceeded solely by those of the American Antiquarian Society, owns thirty-nine. Of course, such comparisons are deceptive, and I have no desire to imply that the Warrington collection surpasses these two magnificent libraries in extent. Careful study and analysis is necessary before any statement regarding its importance can be properly authenticated, and the above comparisons should be regarded as nothing more than a slight indication that it is a significant collection. Undoubtedly, similar lists of holdings from either of these li-

braries could be prepared which could not be duplicated to even a small degree at Case Memorial. The general point should be quite clear, however: the Warrington collection is potentially of equal stature to collections of similar materials found in world-famed institutions. Its rescue from obscurity would be a definite and noteworthy contribution to the resources of American scholarship.

NOTE: At least one acknowledgment is necessary. Without the active cooperation, efficient and courteous help, and realization of the values and problems of the Warrington collection on the part of the library staff at Case Memorial, neither this article nor our actual adventure would have been possible.

A Thanksgiving Sermon Of Jonathan Edwards, Jr.

[Editor's note: On November 18, 1951, the Rev. Wesley C. Ewert preached in the Congregational Church at Morris, Connecticut, a Thanksgiving sermon from manuscript notes in the hand of Jonathan Edwards, jr. With slight alterations to fit the present situation, and of course without the lengthy exposition probably characteristic of the original, Mr. Ewert has faithfully recreated Dr. Edwards' sermon, preached at New Haven on November 27, 1794. The text here published has been taken from a recording of the service at Morris which has been deposited in the Foundation Archives. This sermon is but one of nearly a thousand manuscripts, covering the entire preaching career of Jonathan Edwards, jr., which are a part of the Archives of the Hartford Seminary Foundation. Mr. Ewert, present John E. Hartzler Fellow in the Hartford Theological Seminary, is currently engaged in research on this valuable collection.]

"Bless the Lord O my Soul and forget not all His benefits, Who forgiveth all thine iniquities, Who healeth all thy diseases, Who redeemeth thy life from destruction, Who crowneth thee with lovingkindness and tender mercy, Who satisfieth thy mouth with good things so that thy youth is renewed like the eagle's. The Lord executeth righteousness and judgment for all that are oppressed." [Ps 103.2-6]

This then, is a day of Thanksgiving. For what should we give thanks? The text informs us: We should be thankful for all of God's benefits. The text then goes on to enumerate in particular the things for which we should give thanks. Let us then consider how we have experienced these and other mercies during the year past and are therefore on this day called upon to render thanksgiving for them.

I observe then, in the first place that we are called upon in this passage to bless the Lord Who hath healed our diseases. Secondary causes for the healing of diseases may have been used during this past year; they are all useful, yet in a very true sense God is the real agent of our health. What-

ever has been done by physicians and by medicines, we have really been restored by Him, if we have been restored. To Him therefore, we should ascribe every preservation of this kind, for He healeth our diseases.

Dr. Jonathan Edwards called the attention of his people to an epidemic that plagued their people during the forepart of the year. Well, now, we too are particularly standing in need to be grateful to God, for we have experienced God's divine goodness in this respect during the past year. Recall the blight which afflicted so many of our people here in Morris from January until April. The pestilence was removed. God, you see, healed our diseases. God has dealt with us as a people; He has also dealt with us as individuals. And this demands our Thanksgiving. It demands our thanksgiving, therefore we should bless His Holy Name. Some here have reason to bless the Lord that he healed them personally, for when they were visited by disease, God healed them. Though they were ill, yet they recovered. They were healed. They were distinguished from others who went to regions beyond, who are with us no more. Therefore they are bound to bless the One who healeth all their diseases. Others are no less bound to bless God, because they have been preserved entirely, and there are some of those among us. I say those are still more bound to bless God, still under greater obligation to be thankful.

Another benefit mentioned by the Psalmist is that the Lord hath redeemed our life from destruction; not only from temporal destruction, but the Lord has redeemed our life from eternal destruction. And this redemption is by Jesus Christ. Christ gave himself a ransom for many, for all, if they will accept and apply what God in Christ has done to their lives. For this end was He born, for this end He came into the world and for this end He suffered and died. This is the only foundation of hope for any of us. Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid,

A Thanksgiving Sermon Of Jonathan Edwards, Jr.

which is Christ Jesus our Lord. For this we are to bless and thank God. We can never give thanks sufficient for this Gift. This redemption respects all; it is sufficient for all; all are invited, and it is our own fault if we fail to share in it.

Another benefit mentioned by the Psalmist, is that God forgiveth all our iniquities. And further, He offers to forgive on the most gracious terms. And the offer respects all of us, whether we accept it or not. And for this offer we are bound to bless God. Some here have really been forgiven. Sins have been pardoned. And some here have been justified. They are peculiarly bound, yea, under obligation to bless God.

The Psalmist said that "God crowns thee with loving-kindness and tender mercy." It is God, who not only begins the good work of salvation, but who completes this work of salvation and takes those whom He loves, and who love Him to His Heavenly Kingdom where they inherit a crown. It is a crown, says the Psalmist, of loving kindness and tender mercies. It is a crown which is full of life and full of glory, a crown which will never, never fade away. And this is offered to all. Those who receive with joy the gift offered, are crowned, and they are under obligation, now, under the greatest obligation to bless God.

The Psalmist further says that we should bless the Lord who satisfies our mouth with good things. This refers, does it not, to the common blessings of divine Providence for things like food and raiment, for the common necessities; the comforts of our home, of fire and wood, and water and food? We are on this occasion under peculiar obligation to bless God, because we have been daily supplied with these common necessities. We have been so supplied that we can say that no people have been more plentifully supplied than we. This year in particular, the gardens, the hay crops, the corn crops, have been good. Therefore, bless the Lord, O my soul.

Our relations with foreign nations were more favorable this past year than they were the preceding year. There was grave danger during the past year that this nation would be caught off-guard, but not now. Though all grievances have not been redressed, yet our situation is more favorable than it was. And there is word that prospects are looking up for more settlements among the nations. And this demands our gratitude.

Further, we have the preservation of our civil rights. We are yet a free and independent nation. We have a constitution and our government is preserved. There have been, indeed, attempts to overthrow our government from inside. But all of these attempts have been ineffectual. And this is a kind dispensation of Providence toward us. Our government is the foundation of our peace and our safety and all our enjoyments of outward things. Therefore we are bound to bless God's Holy Name for such a government.

We ought to consider not only how much better is our situation than we deserve, but how much better it is than that of many others. There are many, for instance, who have died. How many have been distressed with sore sickness! We were preserved from many temptations which have befallen others. Owing to this special goodness of God, we ought to increase our gratitude when we compare our situation with others. How many people are destitute of the good things which we enjoy, pinched for the common necessities, for the common things of life! How many are involved in troubles and afflictions of connections in their families, for instance, by the rebellion and disobedience and vicious conduct of their children and other relatives—and these things reflect a scandal on all of us who are therewith connected! Whosoever has been preserved from these, has reason for great gratitude.

It is useful to consider the situations of other countries in relation to our own. So many countries are under arbitrary

A Thanksgiving Sermon Of Jonathan Edwards, Jr.

government, where there is no liberty, no security for life, liberty or property. These are all held by sufferance. Some countries are the scene of war. They are invaded. They are desolated by fire and sword. And many countries are without the Gospel. Many places are in heathenish darkness; some are under popish darkness. One is under the government of infidelity. Many are restrained from free inquiry and many of them can make no free profession of the faith that is in them. In most there is inequality. In many, many of them, the people are sore depressed and dispossessed. And there is no possibility of them rising from the condition in which they now are to a condition that is more favorable. And in respect to all of this, how different is our situation! We have a free government, formed and adopted by ourselves, securing life, liberty and the possession of property for all. Our government is only calculated to the general good of all people in the nation. We enjoy peace. We have the Gospel. We have free inquiry into the Gospel. We can make our profession without let or hindrance from any one. We have great equality. We have equality amid the great diversity of our talents. Improvements can come as industry and usefulness of the individual admits. Happy are the people in such a case; happy are the people whose God is the Lord.

We have now considered the several reasons for thankfulness expressed in the text, as well as some others. We close with some reflections. In the first place, our thanksgiving ought to be sincere. If it is pretended it will signify nothing, nothing! We cannot impose upon God. God has no need of our thanksgiving, but we have need of His blessing. To be sincere, we must have our Thanksgiving attended with a sense of the supreme excellence of God Himself. For all of God's goodness to us is but the expression of God's goodness. To be sincere we must realize a sense of our own failure and unworthiness. If we have not a proper sense of our sinfulness, not a proper sense of the goodness

of God, nor of the love shown us—then we fall short, for we must remember the great goodness of God in showing love to us who are unworthy. If we will properly express our thanks, with proper emotions of piety and benevolence without any excess which tends to vice, then we may hope for the continuance of the divine favors, for it is the word of our Lord,—“to him that hath shall be given.”

Therefore let us say with the Psalmist, “Bless the Lord O my soul, bless His holy name. Bless the Lord O my soul and forget not all His benefits, Who forgiveth all thine iniquities, Who healeth all thy diseases, Who redeemeth thy life from destruction and crowneth thee with lovingkindness and tender mercies. Bless the Lord, O my soul.”

[PRAYER

Eternal God, for Thy gifts to us all the centuries down, we stand in humble thanksgiving. For the gift of the witness to Thy goodness and to Thy Word which has come through the heritage of this nation and this people and in this state, receive now our thanksgiving. For those who have told Thy Word in dark season and in bright season, ever mindful of Thy glory, ever wishing to bless Thy Holy Name, for them, we are grateful. Grant unto us a heart of thanksgiving that we in turn, in Christ's name, may follow in their train.

Amen.]

A Carnegie Grant for The Kennedy School of Missions

On November 28, 1951 announcement was made of a \$75,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, payable over the next five years to The Hartford Seminary Foundation, to strengthen foreign area instruction in the Kennedy School of Missions.

This munificent gift is made on the understanding that the funds will be used over and above the regular annual budget of the Kennedy School, and administered by the President and the Dean on authorization of the Board of Trustees, for five major purposes:

First, to facilitate furloughs on their fields for professors of Area Studies; second, to supplement the work of these professors by securing teaching fellows, preferably nationals of the areas concerned, on annual appointment; third, to strengthen the rapidly developing program of the Department of Linguistics and Phonetics; fourth, to sponsor lectures and inter-university conferences on The Hartford Seminary Foundation campus in connection with cultural area studies; fifth, to augment the supply of learned periodicals essential for research projects along these lines, in the Case Memorial Library.

Each of the five purposes for which the Carnegie gift has been designated serves in some important way to strengthen the program of the school. They explore the major directions in which continuing reinforcement is needed if the Kennedy School of Missions is to keep pace with the rapid developments in the world missions of the Church which it serves.

Continued direct and sympathetic contact with the people and institutions of the area in which they specialize is essential for the faculty of the Kennedy School of Missions. While

the Foundation has long had a policy of regular sabbatical leaves, the Missions Faculty, because of travel expense and the need to offer basic area courses each year on the campus, have not always been able to take full advantage of their leaves. The grant will enable them in an increased degree to realize this periodic on-the-spot contact with the life and thought of their respective areas.

The provision of a few teaching fellows will strengthen the program in two ways: they will relieve faculty members of part of their heavy teaching loads, thus freeing them for research and other essential activities; particularly if the fellows are nationals from the area concerned, they will provide broader contacts and intimate insight for the student under training. Thus, also, the Hartford campus will even more completely embody the Church Ecumenical.

The field of linguistics has seen enormous expansion in recent years. One of the tasks undertaken by the Kennedy School of Missions has been to acquaint students in training for the missionary calling with the most up-to-date principles and procedures in basic linguistics and adult literacy education. Notable progress in linguistics has been made in the field by Kennedy School graduates, as is evidenced for example by the work of Wesley Sadler in Loma (a language of Liberia). But the introduction of these new linguistic disciplines has resulted in imposing excessive teaching loads upon the present staff. The grant will make possible the appointment of an additional instructor and the offering of a fully-rounded program of linguistic and literacy training.

One of the means of extending the influence of the Foundation in the field of Mission Education beyond the normal teaching and research activity of the campus is the sponsoring of conferences and special lectures under the auspices of the Hartford Seminary Foundation. Thus can the missionary leaders, area specialists, anthropologists, linguists, lay sup-

Carnegie Grant for Kennedy School of Missions

porters of missions, and others be brought together for fundamental discussions with our faculty and students. The grant will help to defray the cost of such conferences and lectures.

Finally, the grant will strengthen the library resources at the point where they have been most inadequate. A large number of important periodicals in anthropology, linguistics, geography, history, and other studies directly related to the mission fields will be added. Not only will current issues be received henceforth, but more important than this, back files will be sought. The Library will thus be provided with the most important records of current and recent research and discovery. This will immensely increase the value of our collection both to our faculty and students, but most particularly to those engaged in research work.

The Carnegie grant comes at a time when the Foundation and its constituent Schools are embarrassed, under mounting pressure for outreach, by the inadequacy of stationary funds to meet expanding costs. The grant has been made in such a way that for the coming five years the Kennedy School will be in a position to meet its most pressing needs. Both for this immediate help in strengthening the work which the School is now doing, and for the considerateness with which it has been given, the gratitude of all Hartfordians to the Carnegie Corporation of New York will be deep and cordial.

In Memoriam

Mrs. Arthur Lincoln Gillett

[This memorial, prepared by Mrs. Lydia S. Capen from materials furnished by the Foundation Archivist, Miss Elizabeth DeWelden Root, was read at a meeting of the Woman's Board of The Hartford Seminary Foundation, December 6, 1951.]

A member of this Board for near a quarter of a century, Mrs. Arthur Lincoln Gillett passed away July 29, 1951.

She became a member of our Board in 1927 and was devoted and active in all its interests and regular in attendance until the last few years. She suffered a shock in May 1949 which confined her to her bed thereafter, but she was tenderly and beautifully cared for, and did not suffer pain, but a steady loss of memory.

Sara Phillips Colton was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., April 26, 1867, daughter of the late Dr. Frederick H. Colton and Alice Gray Colton. Her grandmother was Sara Hurd Phillips, sister of the Abolitionist preacher, Wendell Phillips and daughter of John Phillips, a mayor of Boston. She was a direct descendant of Quartermaster George Colton, who was the first of that name to come to this country about 1650.

Her Brooklyn minister in the Church of the Pilgrims was the well-known and greatly beloved Dr. Richard Salter Storrs, whom she always fondly called "Uncle Salter."

She married June 26, 1911, Arthur Lincoln Gillett, Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion in Hartford Theological Seminary 1888-1928 and Emeritus Professor until his death in 1938. They came to live at 16 Marshall Street, the former home of Isabella Beecher Hooker. For almost forty years in Hartford, Mrs. Gillett was a charming and beloved hostess, and her dinner parties were something to remember.

She had many interests to which she gave untiring energy.

In Memoriam, Mrs. Arthur Lincoln Gillett

During World War I she worked for the Red Cross and was in charge of packing overseas boxes.

She had been a devoted member of Center Church since 1912 and a regular attendant at the weekly meetings of Center Church Women, of which she was corresponding secretary for many years.

She belonged to the former Civic Club, Foreign Policy Association, The Hartford Art Society, The Hartford Musical Club, The Ruth Wyllys Chapter of the D.A.R., and The Colonial Dames, of which she was the State Secretary-Treasurer for many years. She was a charter member of The Town and County Club and a member of its Board of Governors 1929-44, Recording Secretary 1933-41, and House Committee Chairman. In fact, this club could really be called her "Baby."

She was known for her many charities and probably few, if any, were ever turned down. Among her special projects were the Children's Museum, camps for underprivileged children, schools for poor Southern whites and negroes, Berea Mountain work and both Home and Foreign Missions.

One of her pet projects was Uplands Sanitarium at Pleasant Hill, Tenn. In an Uplands news sheet, the following loving tribute was paid to her: "Uplands feels a personal loss in the death of Mrs. Arthur Lincoln Gillett, of Hartford, Conn. For a number of years, probably beginning in 1937, Mrs. Gillett was Chairman of Uplands Hartford Committee. This group of noble women sent an annual gift to Uplands of \$1,000. A double portion of her spirit seems to have fallen upon two members of the Hartford Committee, who have been enthusiastically interested in Uplands through the years."

After Professor Gillett's death, sometime in the 40's, Mrs. Gillett became deeply interested in raising a fund to build a chapel for the Seminary Foundation in her husband's

Hartford Seminary Foundation Bulletin

memory, and to this she and her sister-in-law, Miss Lucy Gillett of Westfield, Mass., gave the first large sums.

This Board desires to honor the memory of this faithful and loyal member, who gave generous interest and support to all its activities and who was on the Decorating Committee of Mackenzie Hall when the Foundation was moved to Sherman Street. She was a person of unusually fine tastes and real culture and her name will not be forgotten when Gillett Chapel becomes a reality.

Recent Lectures, Conferences, and Developments

THE CHARLES HENRY BRENT LECTURES ON CHURCH UNITY

Paul Griswold Macy (HTS '14) spent the month of October on the campus, giving four lectures on the Charles Henry Brent Endowment, entitled: "Background: From Diversity to Division," "Development: Converging Streams," "Testing: In Process of Formation," "Fulfillment: From Amsterdam to Main Street." Dr. Macy traced in masterful fashion the roots of Church Unity in the primitive Church, and the progress of the ecumenical movement especially during the last hundred years. With a firm conviction that the movement is "of God," Dr. Macy chronicled before his audience the great drama of the confluence of the International Missionary Movement, the Movements of Faith and Order, and Life and Work, in the World Council of Churches.

One came away from these lectures convinced that the ecumenical movement, with all its imperfections, creedal, organizational, and otherwise, is of God. One also realized with new clarity the need to communicate the awareness of universality to the local church and to the individual Christian. Those who heard Dr. Macy will look forward to his early publication of these lectures in book form.

F.L.B.

LECTURE BY PROFESSOR BULTMANN

Dr. Rudolf Bultmann, the distinguished Professor of New Testament at the University of Marburg, Germany, spoke Thursday afternoon, November 29, 1951, at the Hartford Seminary Foundation on *The Message of Jesus and the Problem of Mythology*. Dr. Bultmann's views on this subject have been widely discussed in theological circles during the past decade.

In his lecture he argued that mythology is not merely primitive science but is a part of man's attempt to describe ultimate, eternal realities in the language of the temporal world. Many of the concepts used in the teaching of Jesus were borrowed from the mythological world of his own age. With the passing of that age these concepts have ceased to be meaningful. Liberal theology solved this problem by ignoring the mythological elements and concentrating on the ethical aspects of Jesus' teaching. Dr. Bultmann regards this as an inadequate solution. He affirmed that the goal of the Christian thinker should be "not to eliminate but to interpret the mythological elements."

By way of illustration Dr. Bultmann suggested that just as the description of God as one who lives in heaven is an attempt to describe the transcendence of God in terms of space, so the New Testament concept of the end of the world is an attempt to express the transcendence of God in terms of time. Although the early Christians expected the imminent end of history they faced that prospect with confidence because their lives were committed to a God of love. Likewise the modern Christian, despite the uncertainties of existence in an atomic age, moves forward into the future unafraid. In Dr. Bultmann's words "He is open for God's future in the face of death and darkness."

Dr. Bultmann deserves our gratitude for his profound and scholarly attempt to translate the message of Jesus into concepts relevant to modern man.

H. K. McA.

CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL
ASPECTS OF SOCIAL WORK

A one-day *Institute on International Aspects of Social Work: Religious and Governmental*, held on the campus December 4, 1951, offered the following program:

Morning Session

10:30-12:30 Church and State in Social Work on the Foreign Field.

Chairman: Atwood Collins II, Foundation Trustee and Hartford Attorney, U. S. Delegation, San Francisco Peace Conference, 1945.

1. Dr. Russell Henry Stafford, President, The Hartford Seminary Foundation
"Address of Welcome"
2. Hon. William M. Maltbie, President Greater Hartford Council of Churches and former Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Errors of Connecticut
"Teamwork in International Social Service"
3. Mrs. Savilla Simons, Acting Chief, Health, Manpower and Education Division of the Technical Cooperation Administration Department of State
"A Global Attack on Poverty"
4. Dr. Robbins W. Barstow, Executive Director Central Department of Ecumenical Relations National Council of the Churches of Christ
"Church Social Service—Abroad"

DISCUSSION

12:30-1:30 Informal luncheon and exhibits

Hartford Seminary Foundation Bulletin

Afternoon Session

1:30- 4:00 Social Welfare Programs in Selected Regions of the World.

Chairman: Francis Gray, General Secretary,
Y M C A of Hartford

1. Daniel Chapman, Area Specialist, Africa Section, The United Nations Secretariat
"Community Development
in the Gold Coast"
2. Harold C. Harlow, Jr., Assistant Professor of Group Work, Springfield College, and formerly Director, School of Social Work, Pierce College, Athens, Greece
"Greece at the Cross Roads"
3. Albert Mayer, Town and Rural Planner in the United States and India
"Rural Community Development
in India"
4. Frederick T. Rope, Education Liaison Officer, United States Mission to the United Nations
"The United Nations—
The Road Ahead"

DISCUSSION

4:00- 5:30 Informal Reception in honor of Dean and Mrs. Harleigh B. Trecker, School of Social Work, University of Connecticut, and Director and Mrs. T. R. Harlow, The Connecticut Historical Society, in Mackenzie Hall.

This all-day conference was the second annual one offered to professional religious and social workers and the lay public under the joint sponsorship of the Institute of Church

Recent Lectures, Conferences, and Developments

Social Service of The Hartford Seminary Foundation and the Department of Social Service of the Greater Hartford Council of Churches. The first such event, which took place on December 8, 1950, considered the relationship of *Older People and the Church*.

The main theme of this year's institute, which was attended by some three hundred persons, can easily be reduced to three words: Change, Adaptation, and Teamwork.

In the Twentieth Century and more especially during the last twenty-five years, human societies and cultures throughout the world have been in a state of rapid and radical transformation. Not only is the rate of change very swift and the number and variety of modifications very great, but also in their nature the transformations are basic and deep-rooted. The speakers were in general agreement that contemporary society finds itself in one of the major transitional epochs in the history of mankind.

When changes are numerous, fundamental, and rapid, the process of societal adaptation grows both in importance and in complexity. To be efficacious, the services rendered must be adapted to the conditions of specific times and places.

Thus, the highly individualized type of psychiatric social case work developed in the United States is not likely to be very much in demand in the Middle East where the need is mainly for large-scale programs of public health, rehabilitation, relief, and economic reform.

Likewise, the practice of keeping confidential privileged information supplied by a welfare client has a place mostly in societies the members of which subscribe in theory to, and practice, at least on occasion, certain ethical standards without which such social work procedure cannot be tolerated.

Therefore, social service must ever be adaptable. It should not permit itself to get caught in stagnant, rigid formulas. Instead, it must ceaselessly seek out practical solutions to

the novel problems emerging in various regions as a result of changing conditions.

An outstanding type of adaptation in social and religious work called forth by the peculiar needs of this age is that of teamwork. If current problems are to be attacked effectively, there must be coordination of effort between all interested parties. Public and voluntary agencies and institutions must cooperate significantly in an atmosphere of mutual trust and toleration.

To governments and their official instrumentalities belongs the task of developing the more important mass programs. Private, voluntary bodies, whether religious or secular, simply are not in a position, financially or otherwise, to render such service. But governmental measures, indispensable though they are, tend at times to be inflexible, cumbersome, and affected by political or nationalistic considerations. The smaller, more pliable voluntary programs have a definite place in the total situation. They can help fill the gaps left uncovered by the larger official schemes. They can serve areas from which official bodies are excluded. Moreover, the religiously sponsored plans attempt to minister not only to the health, economic, and social needs of individuals but also to their spiritual wants. In other words, the orientation here is to the "whole man" and not to any one part of him.

The central question, therefore, is not whether international social work should be carried on under governmental or religious auspices, but rather how to develop significant teamwork between the state and the church in the area of international social service.

CHANGE IN POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

Recently the Foundation Faculty approved certain changes in the administrative arrangements for work toward the Doctor of Philosophy Degree. Since 1945 the Ph.D. degree has not been granted through the constituent schools, but directly by the Foundation; administration of the program has been entrusted to the Foundation Ph.D. Committee. The name of this group has now been changed to "The Council for Advanced Studies." Students applying for Ph.D. work will henceforth direct their correspondence to the Council rather than to one of the component Schools of the Foundation. The entire Ph.D. program, through this change, will be a function of the Foundation Faculty acting through the group especially appointed for this purpose. It is hoped thereby to insure greater uniformity of standards and to relieve excessive tutorial loads incurred by members of the faculty who direct research. The present members of the Council include Messrs. Spinka, (Chairman), Bailey, Chakerian, Clark, Cragg, Parsons, Pitt, Purdy, and Battles (Secretary).

ALUMNI ASSOCIATIONS OF THE FOUNDATION

The Alumni Association of The Hartford Theological Seminary is engaged in a project to bring out a complete Alumni List. Considerable data from a questionnaire recently sent to members has already been assembled by the officers, David P. Hatch, Fairfield, Conn., S. Reed Chatterton, New London, Conn., Russell H. Milnes, Bethel, Conn., Reginald D. Avery, Kensington, Conn., Richard P. Carter, Suffield, Conn., Harvey McArthur, Hartford Theological Seminary, and Kenneth D. Beckwith, Amherst, Mass. It is hoped that this Directory may be made available to Foundation graduates in the course of the year.

There is new activity recently among alumni of the other schools of the Foundation as well. Graduates of The Hartford School of Religious Education living in this area, held a reunion November 28, 1951, at which plans were initiated to raise the balance of the \$5,000 Stoltz Scholarship Fund. Promotion of this fund had been set aside in deference to the Reinforcement Fund Campaign of the Foundation. From a Kennedy School of Missions Alumni Committee a letter proposing organization of an Alumni Association has been circularized among all former students. Miss Elizabeth Root, KSM 1940, and Reference Librarian, Case Memorial Library, is the Provisional Secretary.